



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

KASHSHITES, ASSYRIANS, AND THE BALANCE OF POWER

BY A. T. OLMSTEAD
University of Illinois, Urbana

Few conquerors left so vital an impress upon Babylonian life as did the Kashshites, yet we must admit that we know practically nothing of their race or of their earlier history. We find a casual reference or two in the business documents which prove some of their race in Babylonia, as laborers or as common peasants; one of their chiefs was in the service of Ammi zaduga; once, in the time of Samsu iluna, they raided Babylonia.¹ When next we meet them, they are themselves rulers of Babylonia.

First of these kings of the "Third Babylonian Dynasty" comes Gandash (1745-1729),² who calls himself "King of the Four World Regions, King of Shumer and Akkad, King of Babylon." He restores the temple of Bel Marduk, damaged "in the conquest of Babylon," as piously as any native ruler, and no one would suspect from his tone that he was the Elamite conqueror who caused the loss.³ His son, the first Agum (1729-1707), was followed by Kash-

¹ King, *Letters*, III, 242; *CT*, VI, 23b; *VS*, VII, 64, 183 ff.; Ungnad, *BA*, VI, 5, 22.

² The chronology of the second millennium B.C. cannot at present be fixed with exact accuracy. Our main source is the king list A which gives the succession of dynasties from the third to the seventh inclusive, with the length of reign in each case. Our only difficulty has been to find a fixed point to date the whole list. Such a fixed point has not been discovered, but by the utilization of all the facts we can date within very close limits. It has not previously been observed that if we accept the king list dates for the Second Dynasty, impossible as they seem (cf. *AJSL*, XXXV, 100), the dynasty extends from 2053 (cf. *AJSL*, XXXV, 96) to 1685. Now the last king, Ea gamil, was contemporary with Kashtiliash, third king of the Third Dynasty, cf. below. If we assume that the last year of Ea gamil was the first of Kashtiliash, which is probably not far from the truth, we may date the whole series and we shall not have one single conflict with the evidence, which by this time is far too full for this to happen if the conclusion is not approximately correct. Every synchronism with Egypt is met, if we accept the dates which Breasted, *History of Egypt*, 599, has developed from Meyer, *Aegyptische Chronologie*. The synchronism of the Hittite treaty with the short reign of Kadeshman Enlil II is especially striking. Another synchronism which fits the scheme is that which dates the death of Marduk nadin ahe to about 1107 through the reference of Sennacherib to Tiglath Pileser I. A third point of some importance is the fact that sufficient time is allowed in each case for father to beget son at a normal age. In the list many of the names are missing or without length of reign, but with the evidence before us these can now be dated with rarely more than ten years' error relative to the remainder of the list, where the margin of error is about the same.

³ Pinches, *Bab. Or. Rec.*, I, 54, 78; Winckler, *Untersuch.*, 34, 156; cf. Hilprecht, *ZA*, VII, 309, n. 4; *OBI*, 23 ff.; I, 28 ff.; King, *Chron.*, I, 103 n.

tiliash I (1707-1685), who may mark a change in dynasty.¹ Ea gamil, the last king of the Sealands dynasty, took advantage of the change in rulers to make a final effort to beat off the Kashshites by invading their Elamite homeland. He was driven off by the king's brother, Ulam Buriash, who then "conquered the Sea Land and exercised dominion over the country,"² in proof of which we find his own mace head on which he calls himself "King of the Sea Land."³ Relations with the Elamite country of Anzan were not satisfactory, for Untash gal, the son of Huban Numena, its king, carried off Immeria, the "protecting god of Kashtiliash," and placed the statue in Sian.⁴ The Sea Land did not long remain Kashshite, for the inhabitants rose, and shortly after Agum, a son of King Kashtiliash, must march against them. The center of the revolt was Dur Ea, a fort which appropriately received its name from the god of the deep, and the rebels were not finally subdued until Emalga uruna, the god's temple within it, was razed to the ground. Its place was taken by a fort with his own name, Dur Agum, which long endured.⁵

Kashtiliash was succeeded by two sons, Ushshi (1685-1677) and Abi rattash, by a grandson Tashshigurumush, and a great-grandson Agum kakrime, but our lists are now broken and we cannot date with relative accuracy. The Shumerian inscription of the last named has come down to us in a translation made for the Assyrian king Ashur bani apal.⁶ The new titulary is most instructive. First of all Agum kakrime places "King of Kashshu" and next "King of Akkad," so that we might almost assume that he deliberately substituted Kashshu for Shumer when imitating the old

¹ Ulam Buriash says he was the son of Burna Buriash, Agum kakrime that he was the *aplu reshtu* of Agum the elder, I, 18 f., but this may be reconciled by understanding the phrase as meaning "inheritor," not "eldest son"; cf. King, *Babylon*, 217, n. 2. We can hardly follow Thureau-Dangin, *OLZ*, XI, 31 ff., in making a new group, Burna Buriash, Kashtiliash, and Agum III.

² Chron. II, 11 ff.

³ Weissbach, *Bab. Miscel.*, 3; King, *Chron.*, I, 151.

⁴ *Del.* X, 85.

⁵ Chron. II, 14 ff.; cf. King, *Chron.*, I, 101 ff.; Thureau-Dangin, *ZA*, XXI, 176 ff., reads it Dür-Enlil; Luckenbill, *AJSL*, XXIX, 232, then identifies it with the frequently mentioned place in Clay, *Doc. Cassite Rulers*.

⁶ II R, 38, 2; V R, 33; Smith, *Disc.*, 225 ff.; Boscawen, *TSBA*, IV, 132 ff.; *RP*, VII, 1 ff.; Hommel, *Gesch.*, 421 ff.; *OLZ*, XII, 108 ff.; Winckler, *Forsch.*, I, 517 f.; Delitzsch, *Kossder*, 55 ff.; Jensen, *KB*, III, 1, 134 ff.; Muss-Arnolt, in Harper, *Lit.*, 3 ff.; Thureau-Dangin, *OLZ*, XT, 31 ff.; Peiser, *OLZ*, XIII, 68.

expression "King of Shumer and Akkad." Only then does he call himself "King of the broad land of Babylon." After this, he is once more back to the Elamite frontier with his "granter of dwelling places to the numerous men of Tupliash, King of Padan and Alman,¹ King of the Guti, a stupid people, who rules the Four World Regions." This fine list of titles makes claim to much of Elam and Babylonia, though he seems not to have possessed the southern half of the latter. The main object of the inscription is to record the bringing back of the images of Marduk and Sarpanitum from their long captivity in Hana.² Agum kakrime says nothing of any war for their recovery, so we are driven to assume that they were secured through diplomatic negotiation and that he paid well for the privilege.³

We now enter upon a period which is at the same time one of the most interesting and one of the most exasperatingly difficult in all Babylonian history. For the first time in the course of these investigations, we are able to compare authorities from several different empires, when Babylonia was one of a group of almost equally balanced powers which between them divided the civilized world. Such a condition naturally resulted in a great development of diplomacy. We are unusually fortunate in having large parts of the archives of two of the sister-nations, Egypt and the Hittites, while Assyria has left us a record which, if not exactly a diplomatic pièce justificative, as has been sometimes assumed, at least gives us a more or less accurate summary of the most important diplomatic and military dealings with Babylonia.⁴ Although but a comparatively small part of these documents throws any direct light on our problems, their value in forming a background cannot be overestimated, and we must regret that limitations of space prevent their present study.

Subject for equal regret it is that just at this point the king list breaks off and we are not even sure of the names or order of the

¹ Alman is probably Holwan, the Halman near Namar with a governor (*shaknu*) in the Ritti Marduk charter of Nebuchadnezzar I, King, *Boundary Stones*, 35, II, 22. Padan cannot be the Patina in the Euphrates bend as is sometimes assumed.

² Cf. Olmstead, *AJSL*, XXXV, 99.

³ So Rogers, *Hist.*, II, 107; contra, Hall, *Hist.*, 200.

⁴ Olmstead, *Historiography*, 31.

rulers. Certain kings we may place in this dark period, a Kurigalzu and his son Meli Shipak, each the first of the name.¹ Kara Indash I begins a new series. Comparison of his titulary with that of Agum kakrime shows instructive changes. Already the rulers are coming under the influence of the country. It is not strange that the time-honored "King of Shumer and Akkad" should gain the ascendancy over the barbarian "King of Kashshu" and be placed before it; it is cause for surprise that both should be given after "King of Babylon." This is our first illustration of the success with which our upstart city not only secured but maintained the precedence over all her predecessors and rivals until finally the country itself took her name. Last of all is given "King of Kar Duniash," the "Wall" of the god of that name, which is first applied to a region in south Babylonia along the Elamite frontier and later comes to be the official Kashshite designation of Babylonia as a whole.²

Kara Indash may be dated about 1420-1408. He is the first king of whom we can say with certainty that he had relations with Egypt. It was probably to him that Thutmose IV (1420-1411) wrote "Establish true brotherhood between us,"³ and it was certainly Kara Indash who corresponded with Amenhotep III (1411-1375),⁴ and gave him his daughter in marriage. He was succeeded by his son Kadashman Enlil I (about 1408 to 1402), who is known to us almost exclusively from the letters to and from him which are preserved in the Egyptian archives. It is hardly an attractive picture of him we secure, for he rarely speaks of anything but international marriages, attempting to marry off his own daughter to the Egyptian, then begging an Egyptian princess for himself, above all, seeking for the "much gold" of Egypt.⁵

In due time, Kadashman Enlil thought no longer of gold and women and his place was taken by Burna Buriash I (about 1402-1397), to be followed in turn by his son Kurigalzu II (about

¹ Weissbach, *Bab. Miscel.*, No. 2, though no royal title is given; we are not to place here a Kadashman harbe, father of Kurigalzu, for the kudurru in which he occurs, King, *Boundary Stones*, 3 f., pl. 1, belongs to Kadashman Enlil II, not the first, and the Kadashman harbe is the father of Kurigalzu III; cf. Clay, *Doc. Cassite Rulers*, No. 39.

² IV R², 36, 3; G. Smith, *TSBA*, I, 68; Winckler, *KB*, III, 1, 152 f.; Schnabel, *OLZ*, XII, 55; Rogers, *Hist.*, II, 114.

³ Knudtzon, *Amarna*, 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 3; Uruk ins., Jordan, *MDOG*, LI, 50 f.

⁵ Knudtzon, *Amarna*, 2, 4.

1397-1392). In his own inscriptions, Kurigalzu never uses the title of king; from the letters of his son Burna Buriash II, we learn that he had close relations with Amenhotep III, and that he refused to assist a threatened revolt of the Canaanites.¹ With Burna Buriash II (about 1392-1367), we come to the last of the Babylonian rulers whose relations with Egypt can be studied at first hand. The reigns of his predecessors had been brief, and he was a mere youth as is proved by the almost unbelievably naïve point of view shown in his letters. His accession took place some time before that of his Egyptian "brother" Amenhotep IV, and we possess the very letter he wrote asking that peace be continued as between their fathers.²

Interesting and enlightening as these letters are, it would be a sad mistake if they left us with the impression that the Kashshite kings did nothing but beg for gold, negotiate for Egyptian wives, or use diplomatic pressure for the protection of their merchants. Doubtless this is what they were intended to make the weak heretic king believe; the reality is not to be found in this group of officially correct letters, it is to be picked out here and there in the letters which trace the progress of the revolt against Egypt in Syria and Palestine. Here we discover a series of well-executed intrigues. Rib Addi, for example, reports that the sons of his old opponent, the Amorite Abd Ashirta, are the dogs of the king of Kashshi land and of the king of Mitani, and they are possessing the land of the king for themselves.³ Again, these two kings are connected with the Hittite ruler in the same general relation.⁴ As far south as Jerusalem, it was necessary for the king, Abdi Hipa, to declare his innocence as regards the Kashshi, that an evil deed has been done against him by the Kashshi, who attempted to assassinate him in his own house.⁵

Perhaps the greatest interest attaches to the letter in which Burna Buriash protests against the recognition of Assyria as an

¹ Lehmann, *ZA*, V, 417; Winckler, *KB*, III, 1, 154 f.

² Knudtzon, *Amarna*, 6.

³ *Ibid.*, 104.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 116.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 287. For inscriptions of reign, *IR*, 4, xiii; *OBI*, 33 f., 132; cf. the riash, son of Kadeshman Enlil, *OBI*, 68; Thureau-Dangin, *JA*, X *Ser.*, XI, 122 ff.; Winckler, *KB*, III, 1, 152 f.; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 68; Hilprecht, *Assyriaca*, 93, n. Last certain date, 25-7-10, but one of 27-11-12 may belong here, Radau, *Letters*, 1; Clay, *Temple Administrative Archives*, 64.

independent state, free from vassalage to Babylonia.¹ The appearance on the scene of the Assyrians demands a study of their earlier history.

The city-state appears in the beginning of Assyrian history as in Babylonian but with a difference. In Babylonia, the city-states never really amalgamated. Assyria was more fortunate, for Ashur, whether as city, god, or nation, always dominated the whole region because of the geographical position, and the psychological effect of this unity cannot be too greatly emphasized.

Behind the written history must have extended many centuries of existence, and no doubt in Neolithic times there were already settlers on this defensible position commanding the fertile pocket of soil and the great road as well, but we have not yet found their obsidian implements or their ash beds as in the case of the more northern Nineveh.² The earliest remains yet found show decidedly Shumerian characteristics, roughly hewn of gypsum as they are, in style and in dress.³ It is a commonplace that names of sacred sites are the last to be forgotten of a vanishing population's traces, and we may see good proof of a Shumerian age in the name of the chief shrine at Ashur, E ħarsag kurkurra, "House of the exalted mountain of the lands." Nineveh has the same name as a suburb of Lagash in the days of Eannatum and Gudea, and its temple, E mishmish, is again Shumerian in its meaning. The earliest rulers of whom we have any mention, Kikia, according to Ashur rim nisheshu, builder of the original city wall, and Ushpia, the first king mentioned by Shalmaneser I in reciting the history of E ħarsag kurkurra, must be assigned to this race.⁴

In historical times, it is clear that the ruling race was Semitic, in all probability West Semitic or Amorite,⁵ but this is not the place to discuss a problem which still bristles with difficulties. When history of a sort becomes possible, we are in the presence of an undoubtedly Semitic dynasty. Of this group of at least six rulers who handed down their power from father to son, Kate Ashur is the

¹ Knudtzon, *Amarna*, 9.

² King, *PSBA*, XXXIV, 201.

³ Andrä, *MDOG*, LIV, 7.

⁴ *KTA*, 63, 5; 13, III, 33; 51.

⁵ Clay, *Empire of the Amorites*, *passim*.

first, and it is appropriate that in his name should be found the deified city in its earliest form. His son Shalim aḥum wrote our first known inscription.¹ Ilu shuma built the house of the goddess Ishtar, the Assyrian, and made an unsuccessful attempt upon Babylonia. As his opponent was Sumu abu, the founder of the First Babylonian dynasty, we can date him not far from 2220.² Erishum tells how he restored the temple of Ashur and built that of Adad, not yet forced to cede a part to Anu, the interloper from the south;³ his son Ikunum erected the temple of the underworld goddess Erish kigal, and rebuilt the city wall;⁴ Shar ken kate Ashur, the last ruler we can definitely assign to this dynasty, followed Babylonian custom in shortening his name to Sharruken, not without remembrance of that Sargon who once had brought so much of the world under his sway, an imitation the more marked in that he too was considered a deity by his subjects and wrote before his name the sign for god.⁵ Soon after, we have another such a family group, Ishme Dagan I, Ashur nirari I, who constructed the city wall and the temple of the elder Bel,⁶ and Kisru sha Ashur who rebuilt the Ishtar temple. Since the last claims Sharruken as his "father," it is not impossible that they also belong to the Kate Ashur dynasty.⁷

The earlier rulers content themselves with the simple title "patesi of the god Ashur," and we may assume that they were dependent on a foreign master. In the case of the next known monarch, Ilil kapkapu, we can prove it. Although we are told by later monarchs that "Ashur called his name in ancient times,"⁸

¹ *MDOG*, XLIV, 30.

² *MDOG*, XLIX, 22; LI, 25; Chron. K. 1, II, 14; King, *Chron.*, I, 116; cf. Bezold, *ZA*, XXI, 253.

³ I R, 6, ii; Winckler, *ZA*, II, pl. III, 10; Schrader, *KB*, I, 2 f.; Budge-King, *Annals*, I, xv, 1; *KTA*, I, 60 f.; Luckenbill, *AJS*L, XXVIII, 166 f., hereafter quoted as Luckenbill; *VS*, I, 62; Shalmaneser I, *KTA*, 13, III, 38; Tukulti Ninib I, Ishtar ins.; *MDOG*, XLVII, 40; Esarhaddon, *KTA*, 51; cf. Andrä, *MDOG*, LIV, 26; Scheil, *RT*, XXII, 156.

⁴ Johns, *AJS*L, XVIII, 176; cf. Budge-King, *Annals*, xvii, n. 3; Ashur rim nisheshu, *KTA*, 63.

⁵ Sharruken patesi of Ashur, son of I(kunum) patesi of Ashur, on seal of "Cappadocian" tablet, Sayce, *Babyloniaca*, IV, 65 ff. He is not called son of Ikunum in the Ashur rim nisheshu inscription, but he comes immediately after him, and the restoration of Sayce seems certain.

⁶ *KTA*, 62; Luckenbill, 166 f.; *MDOG*, LI, 47; Ashur rim nisheshu ins.; Adad nirari II, *KTA*, 5.

⁷ *MDOG*, XXXVIII, 33, n.

⁸ Adad nirari III, Kalhu ins., 24 ff.; Esarhaddon, *KTA*, 51.

the god was not an independent agent in the proceeding, for it is also admitted that he lived under Sulili, who is none else than Sin muballit, the father of Hammurapi.¹ His son, Samsi Adad, appears after Sin muballit's son in an oath formula, mute testimony to his acknowledgment of Babylonian suzerainty.² Samsi Adad claims that he rebuilt the Ashur temple in his capital and E mishmish at Nineveh, and neither in his own inscriptions nor in those of his successors is there hint of independence upon Babylon. We discover the true state of affairs from the Code of Hammurapi, where we read how that ruler returned to Ashur its gracious protecting deity, that is, Ashur himself, and made the face of Ishtar to shine in E mishmish of Nineveh.³

For three hundred years thereafter, we do not have the name of a king, which cannot but awaken the suspicion that a chronological error of some sort is hidden in the gap. Then we hear of another patesi, Ishme Dagan II, whose son, Shamshi Adad, was the first to erect the double temple of Anu and Adad (1800).⁴ The introduction of Anu is doubtless to be connected with vassalage to the south. Not long after comes another Shamshi Adad who gives us our first inscription of any length. He begins with the title "King of Kish-shati," doubly interesting because he is the first Assyrian to dare name himself king, and because he does not call himself king of Assyria but "King of the Universe," an old title connected with the extreme north of Babylonia. What is the territory to which Shamshi Adad wishes it to be specifically attached is made clear by his next claim "who devotes his energies to the land between the Tigris and Euphrates rivers." The failure to refer to the city-state Ashur is the more surprising as he is careful to indicate that his

¹ Sulili is regularly identified with Sumu la ilu, the first king of the dynasty. But this would make at least seven preceding monarchs fill the forty years while Ilil kapkapu would rule from before 2176 to 2114, which is exceedingly improbable.

² Ranke, *Names*, x; *Documents*, No. 26; Poebel, *Documents*, 58, rightly takes it as of the tenth year of Hammurapi, 2114, as against King, *Chron.*, I, 127, n. 1. It is very doubtful if the Bel tabni mentioned with Sin muballit in No. 18 of Ranke is Assyrian, as Bel is not found in Assyrian names thus early.

³ I R, 6, 1; Winckler, *ZA*, II, pl. III, 9; Schrader, *l.c.*; Budge-King, *Annals*, xix, 2; Shalmaneser I, *KTA*, 13, III, 40; Esarhaddon, *KTA*, 51; for Nineveh, Shalmaneser I, Bowl ins.; Tiglath Pileser I, Tablet 4; Ashur nasir apal, Ishtar ins.; Bowls; Hammurapi Code, IV, 55 ff.; cf. Olmstead, *AJSL*, XXXV, 94.

⁴ Tiglath Pileser I, *Ann.*, VII, 60 ff.

activities are due to the command of the god Ashur who loves him and that Anu and Enlil have named his name for great deeds among the kings who have gone before. As proof of these great deeds, he tells us of tribute from the kings of Tuqrish and from the king of the Upper Land which he received in his city of Ashur and of a memorial stele which he set up in the city of Laban by the shore of the great sea. If by these he means the Lebanon and the Mediterranean, he had reason for his boasting.¹

In these days of the high cost of living, it is consoling to learn that the early Assyrians suffered likewise. Civilization in Assyria produced what it has always produced everywhere, rising prices. To meet the outcry against profiteers, Shamshi Adad promulgated a decree in which he announced the standard prices which were to obtain in his state. It is of interest to compare them with the tariff decreed not long before by Sin gashid in south Babylonia.² In Uruk the shekel of silver buys three gur of grain, in Ashur but two are given. This is as we should expect, for Babylonia was the granary of the world, and the territory around Ashur could not for a moment compare with it in fertility. In the same manner, we are not surprised to find that in Uruk the shekel will purchase thirty qa of oil, in Ashur only twelve. On the other hand, we should expect that a city which had at its very doors the steppe across which roamed vast flocks of sheep would furnish cheaper wool than Babylonia, and again we are not disappointed, for twenty-five manas of wool cost no more at Ashur than twelve at Uruk.

Shamshi Adad's family was continued by his son Adad nirari and by his grandson Ashur dan.³ Soon after follows another family group, Ashur rabi, Ashur nirari, and Ashur rim nisheshu I, whose brief inscription has given us the names of so many of the earliest Assyrian rulers.⁴ Ashur nadin aḥe was remembered at home as having built the great northern terrace,⁵ and as the first Assyrian

¹ *KTA*, 2; Luckenbill, 166 ff.; for date, cf. 157, n. 17. Streck, *ZA*, XX, 460, is probably correct in connecting Tuqrish with the Tigris of Armenia, Darius, Behistun ins., II, 39. Less probable is the identification with the Turuki of Adad nirari II, *KTA*, 3, 17.

² Cf. Olmstead, *AJSL*, XXXV, 99.

³ *MDOG*, XLIV, 31.

⁴ *MDOG*, XXVIII, 10; *KTA*, 63; Luckenbill, 172 f.

⁵ *MDOG*, XLIX, 18; Broken Obl., V, 4 f.; *KTA*, 64; Winckler, *Forsch.*, III, 248.

king to have relations with Egypt. In his twenty-fourth year, 1475, Thutmose III reports "tribute" from a "chief" of Assur, lapis lazuli, vessels of colored stone, horses, wagons, and various valuable woods.¹ The Egyptian wished to give the impression that this was a tribute offered by a subject. The truth was evidently different, for we find Ashur nadin aḥe's descendant, Ashur uballit, flatly informing Amenhotep IV to his face that when Ashur nadin aḥe sent to Egypt, they sent him in return twenty talents of gold! This amount may be exaggerated, we may be sure that Thutmose returned at least equal value, and it looks suspiciously like a subsidy from the Egyptian court. The same letter proves that a similar subsidy was given to the king of Hani Galbat or Mitani, a fact which indicates retrogression on this frontier.²

Then we have Puzur Ashur who repaired the great wall of Ashur and built the wall of the "New City," for the capital was expanding with the kingdom.³ In his days we likewise learn of the first formal relations with the Babylonians, when he and Burna Buriash "swore an oath and established their boundary in friendly agreement."⁴ It would seem that this was the first formal recognition by the Babylonians of the Assyrian independence, for not long before Burna Buriash had sent to Amenhotep IV a most vigorous protest against the reception given the ambassador of the Assyrians, his "vassals." His successor, Kara Indash II, also made a friendly agreement with Ashur rim nisheshu II, who seems to have been the immediate successor of Puzur Ashur as he finished the "New City" wall with a casing wall.⁵

¹ Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, III, 32, 62 ff.; Breasted, *Records of Egypt*, II, 191 f.; Assur is given as Ys-sw-r².

² Knudtzon, *Amarna*, 16; the fact that Ashur uballit mentions "thy father" in connection with the gift to the king of Hani Galbat, while he does not connect any with the preceding mention of Ashur nadin aḥe, seems to prove it was an earlier Egyptian with whom he corresponded. *MDOG*, XXV, 40, where Ashur uballit mentions his father and refers to his ancestor, proves this Ashur nadin aḥe really was the one who comes a little before Ashur uballit, the son of Erba Adad.

³ Ashur rim nisheshu, *KTA*, 58; Adad nirari, *KTA*, 3, 37.

⁴ *Synchr. Hist.*, I, 16 ff.

⁵ Adad nirari, *KTA*, 4, I, 33; *Synchr. Hist.*, I, 12 ff. There has been much discussion of this very troublesome group of events; cf., e.g., Meyer, *ZA*, XX, 598; Ungnad, *OLZ*, 1908, 11 ff.; Schnabel, *MDVG*, 1908, 27; Luckenbill, 159. But one correction is necessary. The notoriously careless author of the *Synchronistic History* has made just one more mistake, has confused the first with the second Kara Indash, and has thus

After a reign marked only by work on the terrace,¹ Erba Adad (about 1365-1360) was shortly followed by his son Ashur uballit (about 1360-1330). He too had relations with Egypt, and we still have preserved the letter in which he replies to the coming of ambassadors. He calls himself "King of Ashur, the great king," and addresses the Egyptian as brother, a full insistence on equality, though in a private document from his reign he is merely called "King of Kishshati."² His own records, so far as they have been preserved, report only the digging of a canal and of a well.³ But we have other evidence to prove him a great warrior. Since the days of Shamshi Adad, control of all Mesopotamia had been lost to the Mitanians, and now they secured a foothold east of the Tigris in Nineveh; Tushratta could even send its patron goddess Ishtar to Egypt on a healing expedition. By the conquest of the "wide extending Shubari,"⁴ Nineveh was recovered and its restoration celebrated by the restoration of the Ishtar temple at that place. Only a few miles west, at Sinjar, and a few miles south, at Arrapha, the Egyptians had recognized independent states.⁵ This territory, with Musri,⁶ was likewise brought under Assyrian control.⁷

More important in its ultimate results was the marriage of his daughter Muballitat Sherua to the Babylonian Kara Indash II (about 1367-1355), the son of Burna Buriash, in connection with another series of boundary agreements. For the son of this union, Kadashman harbe (about 1355-1344),⁸ we have claimed a series of victories, the annihilation of the power of the raiding Sutu, and the fortification and colonization of Birutu in Harhar. In reality,

made Ashur rim nisheshu precede instead of follow Puzur Ashur; cf. Delitzsch, *MDOG*, XXII, 74. Thus the two events come together in two succeeding reigns, and have a common reason for existence, whereas on the ordinary view Assyria becomes independent too early, for we cannot understand the protest of Burna Buriash if his ancestors had treated with the Assyrians on equal terms.

¹ Broken Obl., V, 4.

² Knudtzon, *Amarna*, 15 f.; Scheil, *RT*, XIX, 44 ff.; Budge-King, *Annals*, 388 ff.

³ *KT A*, 64; Luckenbill, 172 ff.

⁴ Is the name preserved in the Zibari Kurds, Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, 370, as the Missouri Kurds retain Musri?

⁵ Sangara (S²-n-g-r²), Thutmose III, Breasted, *Records*, II, 204; Amenhotep III, *ibid.*, 343; Ramses II, *ibid.*, III, 162; Arrapha (ʔ-r²-rḫ, ʔ-r²-r-p-ḫ), *ibid.*, II, 210, 343.

⁶ Cf. Olmstead, *JAOS*, XXXVII, 178, n. 28.

⁷ Adad nirari, *KT A*, 4.

⁸ Reference in kudurru of Kadashman Enlil II, King, *Boundary Stones*, 3.

these "victories" indicate a period of weakness; that the Sutu could invade Babylonia at all may have been the reason why the Kashshites rebelled against their half-Assyrian monarch and killed him. In his place, they set up Nazi Bugash, the "son of a nobody." Ashur uballit seized the opportunity to invade the land, nominally to avenge his grandson, and placed on the throne Kurigalzu the Younger, the infant son of Kadeshman ḥarbe.¹

The reign of Kurigalzu III (1344-1321) was long and prosperous. Its most important single event was the invasion of Elam and the capture of its king, Hurbatila.² On this campaign, Kurigalzu recaptured and brought back from Susa a small agate tablet, a dedication to Dungi, which had been carried off almost a thousand years before by the Elamite king, Kutur Nahhunte. Now it was dedicated to Enlil in Nippur where it remained until found by American excavators.³ Encouraged by this success, Kurigalzu decided to throw off entirely such vassalage to Assyria as might be presumed by his manner of coming to the throne, and to claim the northern country through the combination in himself of both Assyrian claims. Ashur uballit had died, about 1330, and his place had been taken by his son Enlil nirari (about 1330-1315). The battle was contested on the Tigris. The Babylonian historian claims that the Assyrian king was slain in a great defeat; the

¹ The Babylonian account, Chron. P, with its most probable restoration, has been preferred to *Synchr. Hist.*, I, 19 ff.; cf. Hall, *Hist.*, 267; Rogers, *Hist.*, II, 123; King, *Babylon*, 243; Peiser, *OLZ*, XI, 7 ff. I do not see that *KTA*, 4, II, 2, demands, with Luckenbill, 160, another Adad nirari and another Ashur uballit. The marriage of Muballitat Sherua gives the chronological clue to the dates of the kings who precede Kurigalzu III, the first whose years are exactly given in the king list. He was *sihru*, a child or infant, when he became king, in 1344, but even at that the marriage must have taken place not far from 1360, which agrees with the fact that Ashur uballit corresponded with Amenhotep IV (1375-1357). Now Kara Indash II, grandfather of Kurigalzu, also had relations with Ashur rim nisheshu II, though between him and Ashur uballit was Erba Adad, yet Burna Buriash, father of Kara Indash, wrote several letters to Amenhotep IV, that is, he reigned some time after 1375, so the reign of Erba Adad must have been very short. If we date the accession of Kadeshman ḥarbe to 1355, Kara Indash to 1367, Ashur uballit to 1360, and Erba Adad to 1365, we cannot be far wrong. If Burna Buriash was followed by Kara Indash in 1367, the beginning of his reign of at least twenty-five years must be about 1392, yet Kara Indash I corresponded with Amenhotep III, that is, he ruled after 1411, and between the two, with very short reigns, must be placed Kadeshman Enlil I, Burna Buriash I, and Kurigalzu II. The dates given in the text meet every such test, and the shortness of some of the reigns is no valid objection.

² Chron. P.

³ *OBI*, 43; I, 31; cf. Rogers, *Hist.*, II, 122.

Assyrian declares that his nation won the victory, destroyed the Babylonian camp, and caused the territory to be divided from Shubari to Kar Duniash. That the latter is the more nearly true seems indicated by the eye, originally dedicated to Enlil by Kurigalzu, which has been found in the Assyrian capital. Babylonia was open to invasion, and to secure the road Kurigalzu then built the "Wall" named after himself, Dur Kurigalzu, the most striking landmark today in the vicinity of Baghdad and one of the two rivals for the traditional site of the "Tower of Babel."¹

Arik den ilu (about 1315-1300) is the first Assyrian king from whom we have an annalistic inscription, and the very crudeness shows how new is the form.² Lines divide it into sections which represent separate campaigns, and the account is barely more than a list of names, united by a few formulas. First, we have an expedition against certain cities from which herds were carried off to Ashur. In the same days, he fought with seven thousand men of the Iashubakula on the Elamite frontier.³ The second campaign was directed against a certain Esini, who appears again in the fifth, and who possessed thirty chariots; the places captured were Nigimti, Turuki, Arnuni, and Iashubakugalla. The third was against the cities of Kutila, Tarbilu, and Kudina, and comparison with the report of his son seems to indicate that we are to look for them in the Quti region. In the same days, with thirty chariots, Arik den ilu crossed the Mashtuate River, destroyed six hundred men in chariots, and defeated the ruler of the city of Namubilhi, whose name of

¹ Chron. P; *Synchr. Hist.*, I, 29 ff.; war of Kurigalzu with Subartu (Assyria), Kashtiliash kudurru, *Del.* II, 93; cf. Winckler, *Forsch.*, I, 116; *KB*, III, 1, 154 f.; I R, 4, xiv; *MDOG*, XXI, 38; Ur ins., Scheil, *RT*, XXIII, 133; Johns, *Cun. Ins.*, 33; Sippar, Brick, Scheil, *RT*, XVI, 90 f.; Nippur ins., *OBI*, 35-52, 133 ff.; Clay, *Light*, 286; *Del.* XIV, 32 f., carried from Nippur to Susa; Adab bricks, Banks, *Bismya*, 249; Der (?) ins., carried off to Susa, *Del.* VI, 30; Agade ins., copied by Nabu naid, *CT*, IX, 3; kudurru, King, *Boundary Stones*, 4 ff., pls. 2-5; CVII; seal of Shirish[ti], shakkanakku of an unknown land, son of Kurigalzu, Delaporte, *Cat. Cyl.*, 166; last certain date 23-?-16, doubtful 27-11-22; Clay, *Archives*, 63 f. In Clay, *Doc. Cassite Rulers*, No. 39, cf. Luckenbill, *AJSL*, XXIII, 281, 292. Ninib nadin ahi gives a field in the time of Kurigalzu, son of Kadeshman harbe, and is still alive to be witness to the transaction in the days of Nazi Maruttash, son of Kurigalzu. Further testimony is not needed to prove the ancestry and succession of Kurigalzu III and to disprove the conjectured Kadeshman harbe, father of Kurigalzu. For NI-NI-LAT, equaling Ì-dig-lat, the Tigris, cf. Dhorme, *RA*, VIII, 60, 97. King, *Babylon*, 243, and Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*, 383, still read Zabzallat.

² Cf. Olmstead, *Historiography*, 3 f.

³ The Iasubigalla of Sennacherib, Bellino *Cyl.* 21; cf. Peiser, *OLZ*, VII, 217.

Rim Aku reminds us of the biblical Arioeh. Of the fourth campaign, we can only say that it included Ḥalaḥi, the first reference to the Mesopotamian land which was to be made famous as one of the seats of the "Lost Ten Tribes." No doubt at this time was made the conquest of the Iauri, the Ahlame, and the Suti, the first official mention of a new menace to Assyria, the Aramaeans of the desert.¹ In the fifth campaign booty was brought to Ashur, and in those days Asini combined with some one whose name has been lost, but the confederacy was defeated. Last of all came the conquest of Qummuḥ and its allies, marking an advance into northwestern Mesopotamia toward the Upper Euphrates.²

Adad nirari (about 1300-1280) opens a decidedly strenuous period of activity. The dry list of names which is all that he deigns to furnish us takes on a new meaning when we attempt to place them on the map. Beginning with the Kashshites, the rulers of Babylon, the list goes on north to the Quti, the Gutti we have learned to know as a savage tribe to the northeast of Babylonia, to which it gave a dynasty of kings. Next reached is Lulume, another mountain area whence savages descended upon Babylonia and into whose recesses such generals as Naram Sin penetrated. Finally, we have Shubari, which no longer included Nineveh. So much for the eastern frontier. On the west, the Assyrian boundary was found at

¹ In *JAOS*, XXXIX, 251, n. 2, Peters declares that Olmstead "is obsessed with the old theory of Semitic waves northward from Arabia; his own evidence shows clearly an opposite movement from Asia Minor downward." It is Peters' theory which is old; it dates from the first location of the resting-place of the ark in Armenia, instead of east of Assyria, as it was in the days of Ashur nasir apal. The home of the Semites was still found in the north by Renan, Guidi, Lenormant, Hommel, and such other scholars of the last generation; for bibliography cf., e.g., Maspero, *Hist.*, I, 550, n. 2. It was abandoned for good cause, the best reason being the fact that Semites are rarely if ever found in the mountains north of the Fertile Crescent. Today it is found only in such examples of belated method as, for example, J. Sandaljian, *Hist. de l'Arménie des Âges du Paganisme*, 1917, I, 193 ff. I may add that in the last months, in connection with an examination of Kraeling's excellent *Aram and Israel*, I have for the third time gone over all my collected material on the early Aramaeans; I can only express surprise at Peters' conclusion. Is there not a fallacy in the use of the term Semitic? Those who speak the Semitic languages are as mixed physically as their history would suggest; if there is such a thing as a Semitic race, the term can only be applied to the one group which is fairly constant in its physical characteristics, the Bedawin of the desert.

² *Annals*, Scheil, *OLZ*, VII, 216; Johns, *Cuneiform Ins.*, 33; palaces, Lenormant, *Choix*, 169; Budge-King, *Annals*, xix, 3; Schrader, *KB*, I, 2 ff.; Winckler, *ZA*, II, 313; pl. III, 8; Adad nirari I, I, 16 ff. Identification of Turuki with Tiriki (sic) east of Haine, Streck, *ZA*, XIII, is very probable, but the Tirkahuli of Tiglath Pileser I, *Ann.*, IV, 60, is in an entirely different region.

Lubdu and Rapiqu, near the junction of the Baliḥ and Euphrates rivers, whence it marched with the Babylonian. Thence it extended upstream to Carchemish, whose kings had but recently been Hittite vassals, Kasiassil under Subbi luliuma and Eni Sandan under Dud-ḥalia. It included the fortresses of Sudi and Ḥaranu, the latter no less a city than Harran, the old capital of the west Mesopotamian country. The tables were turned on Mitani, which was almost wholly destroyed. To the north, through a large group of minor towns, the Assyrian domain swept through the whole of Mount Kashiari to Eluḥat. This was a large enough empire, if it were really under efficient control. An Assyrian provincial system was still in the future, but one forward step at least had been taken. Adad nirari's most significant title is "Founder of Cities." With him begins that sending out of military colonies which culminated in the reign of his son.¹

More details are preserved of his war with Babylonia where Nazi Maruttash, who had succeeded his father in 1321, had kept the peace throughout the reign of Arik den ilu. The inevitable battle was fought at Kar Ishtar of Akarsallu, the Babylonian camp was taken, and among the prisoners were the priests. The victory can hardly have been very decisive, for the boundary was drawn from a point opposite Pilasqi, on the far or eastern side of the Tigris, through Arman of Akarsallu, that is, the country where the battle had been fought, to the mountains of the Lulume. Adad nirari resumed the title "King of Kishshati," which he had pointedly denied to his father.²

¹ *KTA*, 5; Luckenbill, 180 f.; Gutium, *AJSL*, XXXIII, 320 f.; XXXV, 65 ff.; Lulume, *AJSL*, XXXIII, 318; *JAOS*, XXXVIII, 230 ff. Lubdu is doubtfully connected with the Labdudu of Sargon, Display 18, by Jastrow, *ZA*, X, 42; Rapiqu, the Rāfiqā near Raqqa of Ibn al Athir and Yaqut, Winckler, *Forsch.*, I, 156, n. 1; the Kashiari towns are Taidi, Shuri, Kahat, Amasaki, Hurra, Shuduhi, Nabula, Ushukani, and Iridi; Hurra is Haria, *JAOS*, XXXVII, 173, n. 13; Shuri is the Shuira of the same passage; Nabula, *JAOS*, XXXVII, 181, n. 31; Taidi is Tidu, *JAOS*, XXXVIII, 239.

² *Synchr. Hist.*, I, 35 ff.; Adad nirari I, I, 7. Winckler-Peiser, *ad loc.*, make Arman and Akarsallu entirely separate, but it is clear that Arman is the chief city of Akarsallu, which lay south of Kerkuk; cf. *Synchr. Hist.*, II, 14. For relationship of Nazi Maruttash cf. *Clay, Bab. Exped.*, XIV, 3f.; Luckenbill, *AJSL*, XXIII, 292; Hilprecht, *Trans. Univ. Penn. Mus.*, I, 104; is the Nazi Enlil of Radau, *Letters to Cassite Kings*, No. 24, cf. Langdon, *Exp. Times*, XX, 458. Kudurru, *Del*, I, pls. 14 f.; II, 86 ff.; Hinke, *Boundary Stone*, 90 f.; *Kudurru Ins.*, 1 ff.; Scheil, *RT*, XIX, 60, of year 11, where called king of Kish; king of Kishshati, Hilprecht, *Assyriaca*, 93, n.; *OBI*, 53-58, 78, 136 f.; latest certain date, 24-11-17; possibly 27-11-22, *Clay, Archives*, 64; prayer, *Clay, Light*, 287.

To this war we may provisionally assign the alabaster vase, the spoil of Ubase, the city from which also came the limestone and clay used to restore the gate house of the Ashur temple at the capital.¹ A temple to Nabu and Marduk was another sign of the Babylonization which was taking place.² Our curiosity is roused when we find him restoring an inscription to a former prince of the land of Kunzuheli,³ and our sense of his reality is deepened when we behold the splendid sword of state which still bears his name.⁴

"In the beginning of my priesthood," so writes Shalmaneser I (about 1280-1255) in place of the later "beginning of the reign," "the land of Uruadri revolted." Here we find the first mention of the country which as Urartu was to plague his successors.⁵ The king raised his hands in prayer, mustered his armies, and went up against their mighty mountain fortresses. He made himself master of eight countries and fifty-one cities. The whole land of Uruadri was in three days made submissive to the feet of Ashur, their men were brought low as corpses, for servitude and to fear he chose them. Tribute that was heavy for a mountain region for all time was imposed upon them. The strongly fortified mountain fastness of Arina had formerly revolted, despising the god Ashur; Shalmaneser found no difficulty in taking it. Over its site were sown stones, its dust was gathered, and in the gate of Ashur poured out as a witness for future days.⁶

Then came the reduction of the whole land of Musri, eloquent proof that its preceding conquest by Ashur uballit was no serious matter. Over difficult trails and through narrow passes Shalmaneser penetrated into Hani Galbat, where he was met by its king, Shattura, or rather Sutatarra, the Aryan king of Mitani, with

¹ Vase, I R, 6, III, A; Budge-King, *Annals*, 4, n. 2; we have only al Ub- but we may easily fill from the Ubase of II, 6. Ubase is also in H. 433; it has a god BU-LA-LA in II R, 60, 27; and it is located on the Assyro-Babylonian frontier by II R, 53, 33 where it is followed by Ekallate (against Jastrow, *ZA*, X, 44, who places it in the Sealands).

² III R, 3, 12.

³ Winckler, *Forsch.*, II, 10 ff., attributed to Adad nirari by ancestors named.

⁴ Boscawen, *TSBA*, IV, 347; Budge-King, *Annals*, 4. It was bought at Mardin, but this is no proof that it was found at Amedi or that it shows campaigns in this region.

⁵ Luckenbill, 186.

⁶ The eight cities are Himme, Uadqun, Bargun, Salua, Halila, Luha, Nilipahri, Zingun; for Himme and Luha, cf. *JAOS*, XXXVII, 174, n. 17; for Arinna, *ibid.*, 179, n. 29. Note that 8 plus 51 equals 59, one less than the unit 60.

his overlord, the Hittite Mursil, and the Semitic Ahlame. Shalmaneser's advance was cut off by the seizure of the passes and the invaders began to suffer for water. "Because of their thirst and for a camping ground, my army bravely advanced into the masses of their troops, and I fought a battle and accomplished their defeat. His defeated and widely scattered troops to a countless number I killed; against him at the point of the spear to the setting sun I waged battle." The loss to the enemy was estimated at four sars, a round number which is too exactly translated by 14,400. Beside his capital, nine of his fortified cities and three sos more—again in the translation 180 gives an idea of exactness which is missing in the original—were reduced to mounds and ruins. Shalmaneser claims sweeping victories from Taidi to Carchemish, but he is only repeating those made by his father and in the very same language.¹

Thereupon the Quti, whose numbers were countless as the stars of heaven, even before they revolted stirred up enmity against Assyria. To Ashur and the great gods he raised his hands and said "Faithfully they promised me their good faith." The camp was left behind; with only the choicest of the chariots he rushed into battle, and from the border of the land of Uruadri to the land of Qummuḥ, remote regions and distant and inaccessible plains, the bodies of their wide-spreading hosts like water he poured out.² We might be inclined to underrate this claim, did we not have proof in the annals of a successor that he so well subdued the triangle of fertile land stretching to the north of Amedi that he could plant a colony at Ḫalsi Luha which should endure for over four centuries until the days of Ashur nasir apal.³

With all this booty, building went on apace. Ashur in particular was adorned, E ḫarsag kurkurra was rebuilt, and various other structures of more or less known character are enumerated.⁴ At

¹ Luckenbill, 163, is hardly justified in seeing in the *ana shashu*, "against him," an indication of personal combat, or concluding that Taidi-Carchemish traces the extent of Ḫani Galbat. The names of the Hittite and Mitanian kings come from the Hittite archives.

² *KT A*, 13; Luckenbill, 184 ff. *KT A*, 15, mentions conquest of Lulubi and Shubari. The bowl ins., G. Smith, *Assyr. Disc.*, 248 f.; King, *Tukulti Ninib*, 133 ff.; 167 ff., add Qumani, *JAOS*, XXVII, 179; Qurḫi, *ibid.*, 182; Pushshe, also *Tukulti Ninib* I, 14; and Nairi.

³ Ashur nasir apal, *Ann.*, I, 102; cf. *JAOS*, XXXVIII, 226.

⁴ *I R*, 6, IV; Winckler, *ZA*, II, pl. III, 6; Budge-King, *Annals*, xxxvii, 13; Schrader, *KB*, I, 8 f.; Lenormant, *Choix*, No. 73; *KT A*, 13; Luckenbill, 184 f.

Nineveh, he erected a palace and restored the Ishtar temple.¹ For the first time, we hear of a new city which was destined to be an Assyrian capital, Kalhu, a day's journey south of Nineveh, near the junction of the Tigris and the Upper Zab.²

With the new additions to Assyrian territory must be connected a curious change in the royal titulary. Characteristic of the preceding period was "governor of Bel and priest of Ashur." To this Shalmaneser adds "the mighty king," which was hereafter to be a permanent attachment, and "King of All," a modification of the Babylonian "King of Kishshati."³ The transition stage is passed when the full later form appears under Tukulti Ninib I, "King of Kishshati, King of Assyria, mighty king, King of the Four World Regions."⁴

The beginning of his reign and his first full year as well, Tukulti Ninib (about 1255-1231) devoted to the north. The lands of Quti, Uqumani, Elhunia, Qipani, Mehri, took his hands; the wealth of their mountains and the wealth of their highlands yearly they brought to the city of Ashur. In those days he also burned over a long list of lands, Qurhi, Qummuḥ, Pushshe, Mumme, Alzi, Madani, Niḥani, Alaia, Tearzi, Purukuzzi, and all the wide extending Shubari. Highlands and valleys, impassable places, whose paths no king before had known, in the power of his abounding strength he traversed. Four kings of Nairi land stood forth in mighty array to make battle and conflict, but they were destroyed and the ravines and gullies of the mountains received their blood. In his expedition against the Nairi, he reached the shore of the Upper Sea, Lake Van. On the eastern border, a series of wars brought him across the Lower Zab and into the mountains, from Tarsina, an inaccessible mountain, between the city of Shasila and Barpanish, on the other side of the Lower Zab, from Sukush and Lalar, including Lulume.⁵

¹ Smith, *Disc.*, 247; King, *Tukulti Ninib*, 135, 173; Ashur resh ishi, bowl, 9; Tiglath Pileser, Tablet 4.

² Ashur nasir apal, *Ann.*, III, 132; there is no foundation for the assumption; cf. Rawlinson, *Mon.*, II, 57 f., that it became a sort of second capital.

³ Luckenbill, 196 f.

⁴ Documents of reign of Tukulti Ninib in elaborate detail, King, *Tukulti Ninib I*; cf. for corrections Johns, *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, VI, 293 ff.; Muss-Arnolt, *AJSL*, XXI, 238 ff.; also *MDOG*, 28, 23; 49, 16; 54, 8; Peiser, *OLZ*, XVII, 308 ff.

⁵ King, *Tukulti Ninib*, *passim*. With Elhunia, cf. Eluḥat, Adad nirari I, I, 8; for Sharnida, Peiser, *OLZ*, VIII, 57, reads Qipani, Ashur nasir apal, *Ann.*, III, 93; Mehri, *JAOS*, XXXVII, 181, n. 31; Alzi and Purukuzzi, *ibid.*, 170; Madani, *JAOS*, XXXVIII,

When the Egyptian Ramses II attacked the Hittite Ḫattusil, about 1287, Kadashman Turgu (1295-1278), who had succeeded his father in Babylonia,¹ seems to have been a sort of silent ally, for we know that Ḫattusil reported the attack to his Babylonian "brother." It was at this time, doubtless, in the tenth year of Ramses (1282), that the diplomatic relations between Egypt and Assyria took place which permitted the Egyptian to boast of "tribute of Ashur."² On the death of Kadashman Turgu, Ḫattusil wrote the Babylonian prime minister, Itti Marduk balatu, that he would not continue the old alliance unless the people recognized as their king Kadashman Enlil II, the minor son of his old ally. Innocent and even praiseworthy as this might seem at first glance, such action might well establish a precedent for Hittite interference, and the Babylonians deeply resented it. Itti Marduk balatu replied that this was not the tone of a brother and that Ḫattusil had written as if the Babylonians were his vassals. Diplomatic relations were at once broken off, though no war took place. Intercourse was resumed when Kadashman Enlil came of age. Soon after, Ḫattusil made his famous treaty with the Egyptian ruler (1272), and when news of this reached Babylonia, Kadashman Enlil sent a letter to inquire if it made any change in his relation to the contracting parties. The reply was far from satisfactory. "We are brothers, against a foe will we fight together and with a friend will we together maintain friendship." Having thus gently but forcefully placed the Babylonians outside the new entente, Ḫattusil goes on to consider a demand made by Kadashman Enlil for the extradition of certain Syrians who had murdered his subjects when they were on a trading trip to Amurru and Ugarit. Very significant is the quiet assumption that

252, n; *KTA*, 17, has increased the number of Nairi kings from 4 to at least 18. *KTA*, 16, gives the land of Ka . . . after Mehri, and Alzi appears as Ilzi; Alara, perhaps equaling Alaia, is before [Tear]zi. Whether the lands of Azalzi and Shepardi, added to the boundary of the country and mentioned between Nairi and Shumer in *KTA*, 17, belong here is uncertain. For Lulume, cf. Winckler, *Forsch.*, II, 1 ff.; in II, 574, he attributed to Tukulti Ninib K. 4525, a badly broken letter with references to the Arame and Ahlame, but this is doubtful. The reference of Ashur nasir apal, *Ann.*, I, 105, to an inscription at the Subnat, is not to the first Tukulti Ninib, as Budge-King, *Annals*, xl, but to the last.

¹ Pinches, in S. A. Smith, *Asurbanipal*, III, 97; Lyon, *PAOS*, XIV, cxxxiv ff.; Hilprecht, *Trans. Univ. Penn. Mus.*, I, 104; *Assyriaca*, 93, n.; *ZA*, VII, 305 ff.; *OBI*, 59-63, 138; latest date, 16-3-3, Clay, *Archives*, 64.

² Breasted, *Records*, III, 162, n. c.

it is the Hittites and not the Egyptians who are now rulers of north Syria. Another demand made by Kadashman Enlil was for the punishment of the Amorite Banti shinni who had troubled the Babylonian land. Banti shinni, quite in the diplomatic manner, had scorned a defense, advancing instead a counterclaim for the enormous sum of thirty talents which he declared the men of Akkad owed him. Hattusil replies that inasmuch as Banti shinni is now his vassal, he may prosecute the claim against him. As to the troubling of the Babylonian land, he shall make his defense before the god in the presence of the Babylonian ambassador.¹

In this same letter, Hattusil urged Kadashman Enlil to attack a common enemy, who can only have been the king of Assyria, Shalmaneser I. Such an attack did actually take place.² We are not told the result, but it is easily guessed. After a brief reign (1278-1270), the greater part of it during his minority, Kadashman Enlil disappeared, and it is clear that Hattusil had worked upon his youthful vanity to his destruction.³ Yet his line endured, for he was succeeded by his son Kudur Enlil (1270-1261),⁴ and his grandson Shagarakti Shuriash (1261-1248),⁵ whose reigns are long enough to indicate relative peace, though it is clear that neither of them reached mature age.

Shagarakti Shuriash must have been a babe in arms at his accession, and the same must have been true of his son Kashtiliash II (1248-1240).⁶ Such a series of minorities could but invite aggression from Assyria where six kings in succession from father to son had averaged over twenty years each. Without apparent excuse, Tukulti Ninib invaded the country, captured the young Kashtiliash in battle, and brought him in fetters to the presence of the lord Ashur, there to be sacrificed. His place was given to Enlil nadin

¹ Winckler, *MDOG*, XXXV, 20 f.; cf. King, *Babylon*, 236 ff.

² III R, 4, 1.

³ *OBI*, 65 f.; cf. Hall, *Hist.*, 370; latest date, 7-8-21, Clay, *Archives*, 64, though the king list gives but six years.

⁴ *OBI*, 64; I, 32; latest date, 8-12-?, Clay, *l.c.*

⁵ *OBI*, 69; I, 32; Winckler, *Forsch.*, I, 110; Nabu naid, Abu Habba ins., III, 28; name on Tukulti Ninib seal; latest date, 12-9-10, Clay, *l.c.*; Scheil, *Del*, XIV, 32; Hilprecht, *ZA*, VIII, 386 ff.

⁶ *OBI*, 70-72, 79; Winckler, *l.c.*; kudurru, *Del*, I, 179; II, 93 f.; grant to Agabtaha, fugitive from Haligabatu, *ibid.*, II, 95 f.; Hinke, *Boundary Stone*, 73; latest date, year 6, Clay *l.c.*

shum, but when the pressure from Babylonian patriots became too great for even an Assyrian nominee, he revolted. Tukulti Ninib returned to Babylon, leveled the city ramparts, and slaughtered the citizens. "The treasures of Esagila and Babylon he profanely brought forth, the great lord Marduk he removed from his abode, and carried him off to Assyria, governors he established in the land of Kar Duniash." Tukulti Ninib was the first Assyrian ruler to face the dilemma of effectively ruling a hostile country and at the same time respecting it as the motherland whence came his own culture. His first experiment had been that of control through a vassal king. On the failure of this plan, he placed over Babylonia governors, though later patriotic writers attempted to hide the reality by listing as kings Enlil nadin shum and Kadashman ḥarbe with a rule of a year and a half each.¹ To the mind of Tukulti Ninib, at least, there was no doubt as to who was the true ruler, for we find him calling himself "King of the Four World Regions, King of Kar Duniash, King of Shumer and Akkad." His refusal to adopt that of "King of Babylon" was a deliberate ignoring of the pretensions set forth by the upstart sacred city.

The action of Tukulti Ninib presents a great contrast to that of all his successors, with the one notable exception of Sennacherib. As in the case of the later monarch, the complete loss of power suffered by Babylon was marked by the carrying away into captivity of the city god Marduk. To make the parallel still more exact, in each case the god remained a captive until his captor was assassinated by a son and a more superstitious successor sent back the god and thus restored independence to Babylon. How consciously Sennacherib was following the precedent set by Tukulti Ninib becomes evident when we find him carrying back, inscribed now with his own titles as well, a seal which had once been brought to Assyria by Tukulti Ninib as part of the Babylonian spoil.²

Seven years Tukulti Ninib ruled Babylon.³ Meanwhile, he built much. The temple of Ishtar in Nineveh rejoiced in his

¹ Chron. P; so also in *Meli shipak kudurru*.

² Budge-King, *Annals*, xxxvii, 14 ff.; III R, 4, 2; King, *Tukulti Ninib*, 61, 106 ff.; 163 ff.; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 71; *RP*¹, V, 85; Sayce, *RP*², V, ix; Schrader, *KB*, I, 10.

³ Bab. Chron. IV, 7.

aid,¹ and he erected a palace at Ashur.² He soon tired of the old capital and began to long for a city which should bear his own name. To the north, on the opposite side of the river, grew up, almost over night, the new Assyrian capital. In the midst of a fertile plain, with a view which ranged from the Hamrin hills in the south to the mountains of Kurdistan, dimly seen in fine weather, the hitherto small and half-ruined hamlet received a new life, and as Kar Tukulti Ninib saw within its gates the wealth of half the civilized world. Around it rose massive city walls, within was a mighty palace, a new temple for Ashur, shrines for the other Assyrian gods. The surrounding region was irrigated by a new canal.³

Tukulti Ninib might indulge the hope that the new capital was "established forever"; the nobles whose memories centered around the old sacred city which had given its name to the empire could hardly remain satisfied. The Babylonians hated their tyrant and their hatred was by no means lessened when they perceived the inability of their new master to protect them against Elamite incursions. Already in the days of Enlil nadin shum, the Elamite Kidin Hdrudash had invaded the land and taken captive the men of Nippur, Der, and Harsagkalama, and though Enlil nadin shum took the field against them, he had no permanent success. Later, the Assyrian governor, Adad shum iddina (1237-1231), had come upon the Elamites at Nisin, a battle took place on the Tigris, and many people were overthrown. Kashshites and native Babylonians alike rallied to the support of Adad shum usur, son of the last legitimate king, and Tukulti Ninib was driven from Babylonia. Failure abroad furnished the needful excuse for those at home to demand his deposition. Ashur nasir apal led the revolt against his father, Kar Tukulti Ninib was besieged, and its founder perished by the sword. The new capital was burned and so sudden was its abandonment that modern excavators found in the ovens the pottery which the makers had not stopped to complete. Peace was made with

¹ G. Smith, *Disc.*, 249; King, *Tukulti Ninib*, 60, n. 1.

² Broken Obl., V, 29; *MDOG*, XXII, 22; Winckler, *Forsch.*, III, 321 ff. The Memorial inscription shows him at Ashur in his first year.

³ Memorial ins., King, *Tukulti Ninib*, *passim*; excavations at Kar Tukulti Ninib (Tulul Akir), W. Bachmann, *MDOG*, LIII, 41 ff.

Babylonia, the boundary placed at Kullar, and Marduk returned to his native city.¹

Ashur nasir apal did nothing to justify his parricide and we hear nothing of his successors. The number of known rulers who occupied the Assyrian throne during the thirty-year reign of Adad shum usur (1231-1201) and the recession of the frontier on the south alike point to a period when Assyria was on the decline. Perhaps the next rulers are the Ashur narara and Nabu dani to whom Adad shum usur sent a letter which has been preserved in a later copy.² With a modicum of imagination, we may reconstruct the story behind two other letters, sadly mutilated now and somewhat illegible even in the days when they were copied by the scribes of Ashur bani apal. The story begins with a certain Assyrian ruler, Ashur shum lishir, who in the time of Adad shum usur's father was driven from his country and found refuge in Babylonia. Ninib tukulti Ashur succeeded to his "lordship," for Adad shum usur refuses to the Assyrian the title of king and grants him only that of "lord of lands." In the "not lordship" of Ashur shum lishir, while he was in exile in Babylonia, Ninib tukulti Ashur invaded Babylonia, but with Babylonian help the former ruler was reinstated. No sooner was he on the throne of Assyria than Ashur shum lishir forgot his former humiliation, and began to speak "words of majesty." Soon after, Adad shum usur came to the throne in the south, and sent a great noble whose name has been lost to be in charge of the petty kings on the northern frontier. With him went a certain Harbi shipak, a Habiri by title and a Kashshite by name, who had come into Babylonia with the gunnu official of Ashur shum lishir at the beginning of that prince's exile, and had entered the Babylonian service. As sharabu official, he stood in the presence of the governor and acted as inspector.

Suspicion seems to have arisen that Harbi shipak in reality recognized Ninib tukulti Ashur as his true lord. He arrived at

¹ Chron. P; *Synchr. Hist.*; Memorial ins.; Tukulti Ashur Bel is not a later king, but the eponym in whose year the god returned, C. Niebuhr, *Bemerk. z. Gesch. d. alten Orients*, 83 ff.; Rawlinson, *Mon.*, II, 59, may be correct in seeing in the capture of Babylon the beginning of the Assyrian empire according to Herodotus i. 95, who dates to this time.

² H. 924; III R, 4, 5; cf. Budge-King, *Annals*, xxii, xxxix.

court with a rather testy letter from the great feudal noble: "One day only didst thou (the king) await me in Zaqqalu, long enough to send those who were counselors and prudent. I was angry, for only one day did he await us in Zaqqalu." Adad shum usur had a reply ready to his hand: "Have I not been gracious to thee, have I not blessed thee with blessings, and they have put thee in charge of the kings on thy frontier. Why then are your words like those of a mere sharabu official?" The former career of Harbi shipak is known to the king, the governor has had him on his personal staff and ought likewise to understand his character. "Who among you," the kings on the frontier, "like a king gives his orders? On him may Ashur shum lishir, lord of lands, fall and may the word of Assyria be similar to that of a sharabu official, and may they disagree with each other. In the land of that one may Ashur shum lishir dwell. Since Harbi shipak came to Akkad, he has been a sinner, and since he came, his lord, Ninib tukulti Ashur, is ravaging the land." The governor has written in regard to a possible meeting with the Assyrian ruler, he will attend to the matter for "the good of Akkad and of Assyria the god desires." Adad shum usur replies: "Do thou as thy heart desires," attend to the necessary arrangements, "let us see each other, send thy deputy with the following instructions: 'The good of Akkad and of Assyria he desires.' [Such should be] the words of kings." It has been further suggested that the governor cross over and see Ninib tukulti Ashur, who has ravaged the land, but he did not fight in that year in that land, he returned home, though an attempt had been made to keep it quiet. The Babylonian king writes sharply on this point: "Since thou hast received the power, why hast thou not entered, and what is this about taking Ninib tukulti Ashur to the land of Iriqa," which as Iraq was to be the Arab name of Babylonia. Then he gives his own opinion of Ninib tukulti Ashur: "Thou hast said of Ninib tukulti Ashur: 'He is a servant, he is not a true man.' In fact, he is exactly like you. Why does he not finish his task? The men of Assyria are women."

Judging from the fragment of the reply which has survived, the governor was great enough a feudal noble to be able to speak plainly: "It is my slanderer who is full of wrath, he is the one who is turning

things upside down; Ninib tukulti Ashur only makes divination and sees dreams, he does not turn things upside down." The king had written with evident sarcasm: "Who among you gives orders like a king?" With equal sarcasm the governor replies with remarks about "old men who are kings and fathers who are" rulers. He makes it clear that the words spoken by someone to Nippur, Sippar, and Babylon, perhaps the charters of privileges, have not been forgotten by them. No one, either the enemy, his sons, or his great ones, shall cause hostility to his kingship. As to the great men of Assyria, the report seems to be that they have given the throne to Enlil kudur usur.¹ The new king, whose very name, "Enlil protect the frontier," showed the extremity of the northern power, was attacked by Adad shum usur and left dead on the field of battle.² Adad shum usur was equally successful with Ninib apal esharra, the son of Erba Adad II,³ and besieged him in his capital. Then the tide turned, the Assyrians were victorious in a battle fought in the vicinity of Ashur, and Adad shum usur was forced to return home in disgrace.⁴ On the whole, the operations had been distinctly favorable to the Babylonians, though there was but partial fulfilment of the prophecy which one Babylonian patriot inflicted as a name upon his son Shar Babili mat Ashur ihtu, "The King of Babylon has defeated the land of Assyria."⁵

¹ IV R², 34, 2; Pinches, *JRAS*, 1904, 407 ff.; cf. Winckler, *Forsch.*, I, 389; Schnabel, *MVAG*, XIII, 43; Streck, *Assurbanipal*, I, xciii, n. 1. The reconstruction rests on suggestions made by Mrs. Olmstead. Here also may be noted K. 2641; G. Smith, *Assurbanipal*, 12 f.; Winckler, *Untersuch.*, 133 f.; *Forsch.*, III, 341. A nameless "great king, king of Kishshati, king of Assyria," writes to a "great king, king of Kishshati, king of Babylon, his father." The text was copied for Ashur bani apal, but Winckler has shown that the formulas are those of the Amarna period. It is not clear whether the sonship is real or nominal; if the latter, it would be from a time when Assyria was subject to Babylonia, but against this is the fact that both are *sharru dannu* and *shar kishshati*, nor would a suzerain permit such a title to an inferior. Against Tukulti Ninib and his parricide son Ashur nasir apal is the fact that there is no proof that the son reigned with his father and Tukulti Ninib went out of his way to omit "King of Babylon." Against Ashur uballit and his son-in-law Kara Indash, his grandson Kodashman harbe, or his great-grandson Kurigalzu is the fact that neither used such a titulary, and the same is true of Kurigalzu and Enlil nirari.

² Johns, *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, VI, 293 ff., doubts King's restoration, according to which Adad shum usur slew Enlil kudur usur.

³ *MDOG*, XXVI, 60.

⁴ *Synchr. Hist.*, II, 3 ff.; kudurru, *Del*, II, 97; *OBI*, 81; I, 34.

⁵ Marduk nadin ahe kudurru, King, *Boundary Stones*, 45, who takes it "Abullu-tetapau, the son of the king of Babylon, who has defeated Assyria," for the determinative for man is missing, but see Hommel, *Gesch.*, 443, n. 1, for the more probable explanation. Why does Hall, *Hist.*, 385, make Adad shum usur also die in this battle?

From Ḫani to the Sealands was the extent of the territory ruled by his son Meli shipak II (1201–1186).¹ Marduk apal iddina or Merodach Baladan I (1186–1173) was at first associated with his father, for we find Meli shipak using only the title “King of Babylon” while his son holds the much more ambitious one of “King of Kishshati, King of Shumer and Akkad.” If the latter claimed all Babylonia, the former made an equal claim on a large part of what Assyria had come to consider an integral part of her own territory.² How much truth there was in this boast, we cannot tell, though the boundary does seem to have been pushed to the Lower Zab.

In Assyria, the second Erba Adad had founded a dynasty which was long to endure. His son Ninib apal esharra (about 1205–1185) was succeeded in turn by his son Ashur dan, who made a sudden dash into the debatable land and won back Zaban³ and Akarsallu, so that now the frontier stood not far from the Hamrin mountains.⁴ The one-year reign of Zababa shum iddina was not to be marked by this loss alone.⁵ In the same year, Shutruk nahhunte, the Elamite ruler, accompanied by his eldest son, Kutir Nahhunte, invaded Babylonia, defeated Zababa shum iddina, and put him to death. His successor, Bel nadin aḫi, managed to keep himself on the throne for three years more (1173–1169) and then he too was forced to succumb to the Elamites, who swept over the land “like a flood.”

¹ Kudurri, Belser, *BA*, II, 165 ff.; Peiser, *KB*, III, 1, 154 ff.; IV, 56 ff.; King, *Boundary Stones*, 7 ff., pls. V ff.; *Del*, I, pl. 16; II, 99 ff.; 112; cf. 91; IV, 163 ff.; X, 87 ff.; cf. De Morgan, *CR Acad.*, 1906, 279; Hinke, *Boundary Stone*, 15; *Kudurru Ins.*, 4 ff.; the bricks, *OBI*, 82; I, 35; Pinches, *Hebr.*, VI, 55 ff., in reality belong to Ashur bani apal. The *Synchr. Hist.* is certainly not a source for a war between Meli shipak and Ninib apal esharra as Rogers, *Hist.*, II, 125. As to the elaborate narrative of Hall, *Hist.*, 385, there is no basis in the facts.

² Kudurri, IV R², 38; Smith, *Disc.*, 237 ff.; Oppert-Menant, *Doc. jurid.*, 129 ff.; Rodwell, *RP*, IX, 31 ff.; Peiser, *KB*, III, 1, 162 f.; IV, 60 ff.; *Del*, VI, 31 ff.; Hinke, *Boundary Stone*, 17, 25; *Kudurru Ins.*, 14 ff.; King, *Boundary Stones*, 24 ff., pls. XXXI ff.; cf. Winckler, *Gesch.*, 93.

³ Zaban at Lower Zab, Ashur nasir apal, *Ann.*, III, 123; in revolt Shamshi Adad, I, 48; IV, 2; Zamban, Cyrus, *Cyl.* 31; in V R, 12, 6, 3, equated with Si-ha-ra ki. The personal name, naru Zaban iddina, shows it a deity; cf. Johns, *AJSL*, XVIII, 251. Located at Altyn Köprü, “Golden Bridge”; cf. bridge found by Heraclius, Theophanes, 492.

⁴ *Synchr. Hist.*, II, 12 ff.; Ashur resh ishi, building ins.; canal, Broken Obl., V, 20.

⁵ Note seal of Zababa shum [iddina], son of Idin Zababa, servant of Shamash, Delaporte, *Cat. Cyl.*, 163.

Kashshite rule in Babylonia came to an abrupt end and the kings who followed seem to have actually been vassals of Elam.¹

The dynasty which follows, the Fourth, is at the same time one of the most interesting and one of the most obscure, a condition due in large part to the mutilated state of the king lists. Its home was Isin, as we must now pronounce the name of the city which as Nisin had given a dynasty to Babylonia before the rise of Babylon.² At once the governor of Nisin outranks the governor of Babylon.³ The first monarch of the line would appear to be Marduk shapik zerim, whose reign of seventeen years (1169–1152) proves either that the Elamite invasions did not have such serious results as our other sources indicate, or else that the peace was due to Elamite overlordship.⁴ A six-year reign (1152–1146) is attributed to the second whose name is lost, and nothing whatever is known of the third. Probably to fourth place, about 1140, we are to assign Nebuchadnezzar I, and with Nebuchadnezzar I we meet one of the interesting figures of Babylonian history.

It is not merely that we are unusually well informed in regard to his reign; that might be the merest accident. The convincing proof of his importance is the manner in which his namesake, the mighty Nebuchadnezzar II, copied his language, his script, in every way attempted to imitate him. Our monarch calls himself the "offspring of Babylon,"⁵ and his father, Ninib nadin shum, was not a king.⁶ With his usurpation, the yoke of Elam was cast off. "Enlil the lofty lord, with his shining face looked faithfully upon Nebuchadnezzar, the prince, his favorite, who is devoted to his sanctuaries, and that he might shepherd Shumer and Akkad, that he might renew the sanctuaries of the city of dwellings and regulate the tithes

¹ Nebuchadnezzar I, III R, 38, 2; Winckler, *Forsch.*, I, 535; cf. for identification with Bel nadin . . . of king list, Winckler, *l.c.*; Schnabel, *MVAG*, 1908, I, 40; *OLZ*, XII, 57; XIII, 353 f.; Thureau-Dangin, *JA*, X Ser., XI, 152; *OLZ*, XIII, 400 ff.; King, *Babylon*, 245, n. 1.

² Olmstead, *AJSL*, XXXV, 80 ff.

³ Nebuchadnezzar kudurru, V R, 56, 17; cf. Hinke, *Boundary Stone*, 127.

⁴ Talcott Williams Cyl., Jastrow, *ZA*, IV, 301 ff.; VIII, 214 ff.; Knudtzon, VI, 163 ff.; Hilprecht, *ZA*, VIII, 116 ff.; *OBI*, 148; Peiser, *KB*, III, 1, 162 f.; King, *Boundary Stones*, 80 f., pls. 11 ff., there attributed to Marduk shapik zer mati; Marduk nadin ahe kudurru, Clay, *Misc. Ins.*, No. 37.

⁵ III R, 38, 2; cf. Hilprecht, *OBI*, I, 41 ff.

⁶ Strassmaier, *Hebr.*, IX, 5; Nabu naid, Clay, *Misc. Ins.*, Nos. 45, 29.

of the temple of Ekur and of Nippur, he broke the weapon of his enemy and the scepter of his enemy he placed in his hand, a life of eternal days he granted him, above any preceding king he magnified his name. Nebuchadnezzar is the king of righteousness, the king of the world, who has laid the foundation of the land."¹

We have no annals from his reign, but this lack is in some respects more than made good by a series of highly interesting accounts of his campaigns against Elam. In one of these, hardly meant, we should imagine, for the public eye, we have the very frank admission that at first he was not successful. He tells us of the troubles suffered under Zababa shum iddina and Bel nadin ahi, his predecessors on the throne, and of his brave resolve to die with his soldiers who had been slaughtered in Elam. With the remnant of his people, he reached the source of the Uknu, well within the enemy's country, and awaited them. Once more he faced defeat, his infantry was slaughtered, his cavalry fled in disorder. Again comes a very frank admission, "I sought not the battle, I retreated to Dur Apil Sin, I sat down defeated. The Elamite followed, I fled before him, I sat on the bed of weeping and lamentation."²

Seated in Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar roared like a lion and bellowed like the god Adad. To Marduk, the lord of Babylon, went his prayer: "Have pity on me, have pity on my land where are weeping and sorrow. How long, lord of Babylon, in the land of the foe wilt thou abide? To Esagila, which thou lovest, turn thy face." The lord of Babylon heard Nebuchadnezzar, his word from heaven came to him: "With my own mouth speak I to thee, a word of grace send I to thee, with my help shalt thou go to Amurru, from the hostile Elam to Babylon bring me. Elam will I give thee."³

The soldiers whom he had conquered with weapons, as by himself, as those who are dead from cold, their hands were clinched together, their dead bodies were found, right and left, before and behind, he poured like a flood, inside and outside the city, lowland and high place, he filled with destruction, he made a desert. Nebuchadnezzar, the pious, the obedient, who unceasingly works toward his purpose, who until the gods awarded him

¹ Hinke, *Boundary Stone of Nebuchadnezzar*, 1907; *Selected Kudurru Inscriptions*, 1911, 21 ff. Charter granted to Nusku ibni, mayor of Nippur, who is also priest of Enlil, a curious survival, under other names, of the older subject patesi.

² III R, 38, 2; Winckler, *Forsch.*, I, 534 ff.

³ CT, XIII, 48; previously given in Winckler, *Texte*, II, 72; *Forsch.*, 542 ff., though CT says "published for the first time."

the desire of his heart, ceased not from weeping, daily, unceasingly, bowing down left not my heart, on my goodly bed at night I ended not my sleep.¹

The king's heart was cheered by the accession of two important Elamite nobles, Shamua, the son of Nur lishir, and his son Shamai, former priests of Ria in the city of Din sharri, and he willingly promised to restore them.² Another eastern chief had entered his service as commander of the chariotry, Ritti Marduk of Bit Karziabku.³ Nebuchadnezzar

received his commission from the king of the gods, Marduk, and he raised his weapons to avenge Akkad. From the city of Der, the city of the god Anu, he marched for thirty double hours. In the month of Dumuzu (July), he took the road. The pickaxe burned like fire, the sand of the roads scorched like flame, there was no water in the cistern and drinking water was cut off, the vigor of the mighty horses failed, and the legs of the strong hero turned aside. The majestic king advanced, with the support of the gods, Nebuchadnezzar marched forward, he had no rival. He feared not the difficult country, the yoked horses he urged on. Ritti Marduk, the lord of Bit Karziabku, his chief charioteer, at the right hand of the king, his lord did not see, and his chariot he drove forward. The mighty king hastened, he came to the bank of the river Ula. The kings took their position opposite each other, they made battle, in their midst fire flashed forth. The face of the Sun God was obscured by their dust, the hurricane swept along, the storm raged. In the storm of their battle, the lord of the chariot did not see the companion at his side. Ritti Marduk, the lord of the house of Bit Karziabku, his chief charioteer, did not remain at the side of the king, his lord, he drove forward his chariot. He did not fear battle, he went down against the enemy, and among the enemy of his lord he valiantly entered. By the command of the gods Ishtar and Adad, the lords of the battle, Hulteludish, the king of Elam, turned and died,⁴ and king Nebuchadnezzar stood in triumph, he took captive the land of Elam, he made spoil of its possessions.⁵

Marduk, as a result of my prayer of lamentation, of my raising of the hand in worship, and of the downcasting of my face, whereby I daily

¹ IV R, 20, 1; Winckler, *Forsch.*, I, 538 ff.; Martin, *RT*, XXIV, 96 ff.

² Kudurru, S. A. Smith, *Letters*, IV, pls. viii f.; *CT*, IX, 4 f.; Meissner, *ZA*, IV, 259 ff.; Winckler, *ibid.*, 403 ff.; Peiser, *KB*, III, 1, 172 f.; King, *Boundary Stones*, 96 ff., pls. XCV f.

³ Read Lakti Shipak of Bit Karziashku, Hüsing, *OLZ*, XVII, 156.

⁴ For correction of text and identification with Hulteludush-Inshushinak, successor of Shilhak In Shushinak, *Del*, XI, No. 97 ff., cf. Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, X, 97 ff.

⁵ Kudurru, V R, 55 ff.; Hilprecht, *Freibrief Nebukadnezar's*, I, 1883; Pinches-Budge, *PSBA*, VI, 144 ff.; Peiser, *KB*, III, 1, 164 ff.; C. D. Gray, in Harper, *Lit.*, 8 ff.; King, *Boundary Stones*, 29 ff., pls. LXXXIII ff.

approached him and wept, turned his face to enter the holy city, from the hostile land of Elam he took the high road, the path of joy, the desired way to Babylon. When the men of the land saw his exalted, beautiful, and lovely form, they were all prepared to greet the shining lord. He passed in and entered his abode of peace; Bab Sulim, the shrine of his lordship gleamed, was full of joy. The heaven brought forth its abundance, the earth its richness, the sea its dolphins, the mountain its products, without like. All that had tongue brought their rich tribute to the lord of lords, lambs for the slaughter, mighty bulls, imposing offerings, sheep, and incense. The incense raised a pleasant odor. I will praise his might, his strength will I praise, his lordship will I praise. His heart he fixed for return, he heard my prayer, his neck he turned. The Elamite who feared not his great godhead, who had spoken insolence against his great godhead, use thy weapons against the overbearing Elamites, destroy his troops, scatter his forces, destroy like smoke, take away like the flood.¹

With Bel Marduk returned from Elam the god Ria to rejoice the hearts of Shamua and Shamai. He was settled in Hussi, where his former priests were still to exercise their offices, supported by grants of land from Upi, Dur Sharrukin, Bit Bazi, and Bit Akkarnakkandi, the last of which was to be considered the especial city of Ria.² The cities of Bit Karziabku had under a former king been free from taxes, but through enemies and contrary to their laws it had come to pay the *ilku* dues of the Namar province. In return for the service which the king had seen rendered among his enemies by Ritti Marduk, he gave a decision and the cities enjoyed their freedom from taxation as in former times.³

Nebuchadnezzar furthermore claims that he overthrew the mighty Lulubi with the sword, conquered the Amorites, and despoiled the Kashshites.⁴ The boasts as to the Kashshites and the Lulubi may be due merely to his having conquered representatives of these various peoples in his battles with Elam; the war with the Amorites was more serious. In the month of May, in the third year of Nebuchadnezzar, the men of the Hittite land opposed his troops, in other words, they invaded Babylonia. Nebuchadnezzar summoned his

¹ IV R, 20, 1; cf. the astrological letter, Thompson, *Reports*, 200, where a prediction is "according to the tablet 'How Nebuchadnezzar spoiled Elam.'"

² Kudurru, King, *Boundary Stones*, 96 ff.

³ V R, 55 ff. A study on Babylonian feudalism in its relation to the land system is under way.

⁴ Ritti Marduk kudurru.

troops, in thirteen days to the Hittite country he marched, he struck off the heads of the men of Ammananu, impaled them on poles, carried them off into captivity.¹

For one series of events in his reign, the relations with Assyria, we have a fairly good record. After a long reign (about 1185–1155), Ashur dan had been followed by Mutakkil Nusku (about 1155–1135), of whom we have but the mention of his name,² and he by Ashur resh ishi (1135–1110), with whom another advance begins. He claims to have subdued the Ahlame, the Lullume, and the Quti; his most significant title, however, is “Avenger of Assyria,”³ which he earned by his wars with Babylon. The initiative was taken by Ashur resh ishi, but it was not long before Nebuchadnezzar, fresh from his wars with Elam, took vengeance for the breaking of the treaty of complete alliance which had formerly held between them by driving him home. He collected his siege engines and advanced to the Assyrian fort of Zanqi. Ashur resh ishi fell upon him at this place and forced him to retreat hurriedly, burning his siege train behind him. Nebuchadnezzar collected a new army and made a second attempt to invade Assyria, but again the defenders were victorious, forty chariots were taken, and the leader of the expedition; Karashtu by name, fell into their hands.⁴ The four kings had ruled successfully ninety-five years, the way was prepared for Tiglath Pileser I.

After a reign of at least sixteen years (1140–1124), Nebuchadnezzar was followed by Enlil nadin apal, of whom we know nothing, save as a boundary stone hints at a troubled succession, and proves at least four years of rule (1124–1120).⁵ We have a considerable

¹ Strassmaier, *Hebr.*, IX, 4 f.; Winckler, *Textbuch*², 56 f., and Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels*, 369 f., attribute it to the second Nebuchadnezzar, but the obverse—or is it the reverse?—specifically refers to the memorial stone set up by Nebuchadnezzar, the son of Ninib nadin shum.

² Tiglath Pileser I, *Ann.*, VII, 45; Nineveh palace, G. Smith, *Disc.*, 251.

³ Bowl ins., III R, 3, 6 ff.; Budge-King, *Annals*, 17 ff.; Schrader, *KB*, I, 1, 12 ff., erected a palace in Apki, Broken Obl. 34, doubtfully connected with the Apki of Ashur nasir apal, Kurkh ins., I, 32.

⁴ *Synchr. Hist.*, II, 18 ff. Hall, *Hist.*, 387, places this battle “in North-western Mesopotamia, in the Euphrates Valley somewhere about the mouth of the Khabur,” but there is no evidence for this location and it is improbable.

⁵ *OBI*, 83; I, 38 ff.; Oppert, *ZA*, VIII, 360; Hilprecht, *Assyriaca*, 1 ff.; Peiser, *KB*, IV, 64 ff.; Hinke, *Boundary Stone*, 12; *Kudurru Ins.*, 28 ff.; Toffteen, *Chron.*, 83 ff.; cf. kudurru from his period, King, *Boundary Stones*, 76 ff., pls. I ff.

number from the reign of Marduk nadin aḫe (1120–1107), but they tell us next to nothing of what we would know as to political conditions.¹ We learn that he ruled at least thirteen years (1120–1107), that his territory extended as far to the northeast as Bit Ḫamban, and that before his tenth year he had defeated Assyria and thereafter made a grant of land to his faithful servant Adad zer iqisha for the part he had played in the battle.² His wars with Tiglath Pileser, the mighty son of Ashur resh ishi, proved disastrous,³ and his place was taken by Marduk shapik zer mati.

Of Marduk shapik zer mati (1107–1080), we only hear that he made a treaty of complete alliance with Ashur bel kala, Tiglath Pileser's son, and "went from Assyria to Sippar," a phrase which points to Assyrian overlordship and to a loss of prestige by Babylon so great that it must now cede to another city. Perhaps this Assyrian lordship was the reason why forty-four kings of the lands "saw abundance."⁴ His Assyrian policy availed him little, for he was soon driven from his land and his place taken by Adad apal iddina (1080–1058).⁵ The Assyrian account briefly disposes of him as the son of a nobody, Esaggil shaduni. The late Babylonian narrator informs us that he was the son of Itti Marduk balatu, the Aramaean, the usurping king.⁶ Now we do actually have two inscriptions of an Itti Marduk balatu, one a deed dated in the reign of Itti Marduk balatu,⁷ the other is of an Itti Marduk balatu, king

¹ Tablet from Za'aleh, 12 miles northwest of Babylon, I R, 66; Oppert, *Expéd. Mesop.*, I, 252 f.; *Doc.*, 81 ff.; *RP*¹, IX, 91 f.; Peiser, *KB*, IV, 66 ff.; cf. III, 1, 174 f.; G. Smith, *TSBA*, I, 74; King, *Boundary Stones*, 98 f., pl. XCVII; Yale kudurru, *Clay, Misc. Ins.*, No. 37; Warwick kudurru, Sayce, *PSBA*, XIX, 70 ff.; Nippur kudurru, Hilprecht, *Explorations*, 519; Ashur ins., *MDOG*, XXII, 20; probably from his reign is III R, 41 f.; Oppert, *Doc.*, 117 ff.; *RP*¹, IX, 103 ff.; Belser, *BA*, II, 124 ff.; Peiser, *KB*, IV, 74 ff.; Hinke, *Kudurru Ins.*, 30 ff.; King, *Boundary Stones*, 37 ff., pls. LIII ff.; also the Amran ibn Ali kudurru, Koldewey, *MDOG*, VII, 27 ff.

² Kudurru, III R, 43 f.; Oppert, *Doc.*, 98 ff.; *RP*¹, IX, 96 ff.; Belser, *BA*, II, 116 ff.; Peiser, *KB*, IV, 68 ff.; Hinke, *Kudurru ins.*, 33 ff.; King, *Boundary Stones*, 42 ff., pls. XLIII ff.

³ For details, cf. Olmstead, *JAOS*, XXXVII, 183 ff.

⁴ *Synchr. Hist.*, II, 41 ff.; Chron. K, 3, I, 8.

⁵ Kudurru, King, *Boundary Stones*, 81 f., pl. 14; tablet, *ibid.*, 99 ff., pl. 17.

⁶ *Synchr. Hist.*, l.c.; Chron. K, l.c.

⁷ King, *Boundary Stones*, 108 ff., pl. CVI; placed by King, p. ix, in the Ninth Dynasty, though in his *History of Babylon* no such ruler is there listed. The tablet is too fragmentary for certain connection, though the witness Taqisha . . . might be compared with Taqisha Belit who witnesses the Adad zer iqisha charter of Marduk nadin aḫe, II, 7.

of an unknown region, beloved of the great gods. He is the son of a ruler whose name may be read Marduk nadin¹ aḥe, the exalted prince, the hero, governor of Babylon, called by Anu and Dagan, patesi of another god and goddess, king of an unknown region, king of Shumer and Akkad.² The name also occurs in a list of kings who are unfortunately not in chronological order.³ If his father was indeed Marduk nadin aḥe, then we have in him the legitimate successor of his father, with Marduk shapik zer mati as the usurper and Adad apal iddina as the restorer of the dynasty.⁴ Stranger things have happened in history than such a successful denial of the truth.

So perhaps after all we need not be surprised that Ashur bel kala was even more friendly to him than to his predecessor. So good were the relations that he married the daughter of Adad apal iddina. Special emphasis is laid by the scribe on her rich dowry;⁵ it is quite within the range of the possibilities that Ashur bel kala did not go to Babylonia for the sole purpose of a marriage, that the daughter and the rich dowry were the price paid to Assyria for aid in winning back the lost Der, in extending the rule of Babylon as far south as Nippur, and in protecting the country from further incursions of the desert nomads, the Sutu, who had just plundered Shumer and Akkad.⁶ Long after, it was remembered how the Sutu in their raid had destroyed the great Shamash temple at Sippar and had brought its ceremonies to a close.⁷

After reigning twenty-two years, Adad apal iddina was followed by Marduk aḥe erba, whose brief sway of a year and a half has given us but a single boundary inscription.⁸ The next king ruled thirteen

¹ So read for the KAB of Winckler?

² Winckler, *Untersuch.*, 139; I cannot at the moment verify the reference to VS, I, No. 112.

³ V R, 44.

⁴ Rogers, *Hist.*, II, 131, places Itti Marduk balatu as successor of Marduk nadin aḥe with the year-and-a-half reign which the king list assigns to the ninth ruler of the dynasty, and follows him with Marduk shapik zer mati.

⁵ *Synchr. Hist.*, l.c.

⁶ Chron. K, 3.

⁷ Nabu apal iddina tablet; cf. King, *Boundary Stones*, 120, pls. XCVIII ff. Cf. also cone, Place, *Nineve*, III, 78; II, 308; Smith, *TSA*, I, 72; Winckler, *Untersuch.*, 28, n. 2; Hilprecht, *Explorations*, 519; King, *Boundary Stones*, 81 f., pl. 14; 99 ff., pl. 17.

⁸ Scheil, *RT*, XVI, 32 ff.; *OBI*, 149; Hinke, *Boundary Stones*, 188 ff.

years (1057–1044), but the list has preserved only Marduk zer of his name. The nine years' reign of Nabu shum libur (1044–1035) brought the dynasty to an inglorious end.¹ Hereafter the rulers, even when nominally independent, are satellites of Assyria, and Babylonian history is thenceforth a phase, though a particularly interesting phase, of the Assyrian control of dependencies.

¹ Duck weight in which he still calls himself king of Kishshati, Layard, *Inscriptions*, 83 f.; Norris, *JRAS*, XVI, 215; Weissbach, *ZDMG*, LXI, 394 f.; King, *PSBA*, XXIX, 221; *Religious Chronicle*, King, *Chron.*, II, 72, 159, where the broken context makes the reading uncertain. A kudurru dated in the reign of Nabu iddina shumu, with characters of the end of the dynasty, is mentioned by Sayce, *Expos. Times*, XIX, 498.